

Canada, Privileges and  
Elections, Standing Committee  
on, 1955

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament  
1955

Government  
Publications

STANDING COMMITTEE

ON

LIBRARY

APR 27 1955

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Chairman: G. Roy McWILLIAM, Esq.

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 10

TUESDAY, APRIL 5, 1955

CANADA ELECTIONS ACT

WITNESSES:

Mr. Nelson J. Castonguay, Chief Electoral Officer;  
Captain J. P. Dewis, RCN, Deputy Judge Advocate General.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.  
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY  
OTTAWA, 1955.

STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON  
PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

*Chairman:* G. Roy McWilliam, Esq., and

Messrs.

Bourque	Hansell	Pouliot
Bryson	Hollingworth	Power ( <i>St. John's West</i> )
Buchanan	Leboe	Richard ( <i>Ottawa East</i> )
Cardin	Lefrançois	Robichaud
Cavers	MacKenzie	Robinson ( <i>Bruce</i> )
Churchill	Meunier	Vincent
Dechene	Nowlan	Weaver
Dickey	Pallett	White ( <i>Waterloo South</i> )
Ellis	Perron	Zaplitny
Fraser ( <i>Peterborough</i> )		

Members, 29.

Quorum, 10.

Antoine Chassé,  
*Clerk of the Committee.*



ORDER OF REFERENCE

MONDAY, April 4, 1955.

Ordered,—That the name of Mr. Weaver be substituted for that of Mr. MacDougall; and

That the name of Mr. Robichaud be substituted for that of Mr. Viau; and

That the name of Mr. Buchanan be substituted for that of Mr. Harrison on the said Committee.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,  
*Clerk of the House.*





## MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

House of Commons, Room 497,  
TUESDAY, April 5, 1955.

The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Mr. G. Roy McWilliam, presided.

*Members present:* Messrs. Bourque, Buchanan, Bryson, Cardin, Cavers, Dechêne, Dickey, Ellis, Fraser (*Peterborough*), Hansell, Hollingworth, Lefrançois, McWilliam, Meunier, Nowlan, Pouliot, Power (*St. John's West*), Richard (*Ottawa East*), Robinson (*Bruce*), Robichaud, Vincent, Weaver, White (*Waterloo South*), and Zaplitny.

*In attendance:* Mr. Nelson J. Castonguay, Chief Electoral Officer, Mr. E. A. Anglin, Q.C., Assistant Chief Electoral Officer; also, Captain J. P. Dewis, RCN, Deputy Judge Advocate General.

The Committee resumed the section by section study and the various schedules thereto of the Canada Elections Act and considered amendments suggested in turn by the Chief Electoral Officer, Department of National Defence and other suggestions of individual members of the Committee.

Mr. Castonguay was recalled.

It was agreed that the Committee revert to the study of the Canadian Forces Voting Regulations contained in Schedule Three to the Canada Elections Act, and during study of the next three amendments, Captain Dewis was questioned on certain aspects thereof.

On paragraph 4 of the said Regulations,

On motion of Mr. Dechêne,

*Resolved*,—That sub-paragraph (j) of Paragraph 4 be further amended by striking out the words "by mail", where they appear in the second line of the said sub-paragraph.

On Paragraph 12 of the said Regulations,

On motion of Mr. Dechêne,

*Resolved*,—That the amendment to sub-paragraph (e) of Paragraph 12, as adopted by the Committee at its next preceding sitting on March 31st, be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"(e) secure from the various liaison officers the lists provided for in paragraph 26;"

On Paragraph 26 of the said Regulations,

On motion of Mr. Dechêne,

*Resolved*,—That sub-paragraphs (a) and (b) appearing in the amendment to Paragraph 26, as adopted by the Committee at its next preceding meeting on March 31st, be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

(a) the names, ranks, numbers and, in the case of those who completed statements under paragraph 22, places of ordinary residence as shown on such statements of Canadian Forces electors, as defined in paragraph 20, attached to his unit, and

(b) the names of Canadian Forces electors, as defined in paragraph 20A, who are married to Canadian Forces electors described in clause (a), and the names, ranks, numbers and, in the case of those whose husbands completed statements under paragraph 22, places of ordinary residence as shown on such statements of their husbands;

On Section 14 of the Act

On motion of Mr. Hollingworth,

*Resolved*,—That the following amendment to the said Section be recommended:

Subsection (6) of section 14 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(6) A Canadian Forces elector, as defined in paragraph 20 of *The Canadian Forces Voting Regulations*, is entitled to vote

(a) at a by-election only at the place of his ordinary residence as shown on the statement made by him under paragraph 22 of those Regulations, and

(b) at a general election only under the procedure set forth in those Regulations, or, if he has not voted under that procedure, at the place of his ordinary residence as shown on the statement made by him under paragraph 22 of those Regulations.

On motion of Mr. Vincent,

*Resolved*,—That a further amendment to the said section be recommended:

That paragraph (h) of subsection (2) of Section 14 of the said Act be repealed and that paragraph (i) thereof be relettered (h).  
It was agreed that the said Section otherwise remain unchanged.

On Section 16

On motion of Mr. White (*Waterloo South*),

*Resolved*,—That the following amendment to the said Section be recommended:

Subsection (5) of section 16 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(5) A Canadian Forces elector, as defined in paragraph 20 of *The Canadian Forces Voting Regulations*, shall be deemed to continue to ordinarily reside in the place of his ordinary residence as shown on the statement made by him under paragraph 22 of those Regulations.

On motion of Mr. Dechêne, it was agreed that Schedule Four of the Act remain unchanged.

On motion of Mr. Robichaud, it was agreed that Schedule Five of the Act remain unchanged.

On Section 100 of the said Act

On motion of Mr. Hollingworth,

*Resolved*,—That the 3rd paragraph of the amendment to the said Section, adopted by the Committee on March 29th, be rescinded.

On Section 94 of the said Act,

Mr. Zaplitny moved the following resolution:

That the privilege of voting at an advance poll be extended to include any qualified voter who completes a declaration to the effect that he will be unable to vote on polling day in the polling division in which he ordinarily resides.



After debate thereon and the question having been put on the said proposed resolution of Mr. Zaplitny it was, on a show of hands, resolved in the negative, on the following division: *Yeas, 7; Nays, 15.*

On motion then of Mr. White (*Waterloo South*),

*Resolved*,—That the following amendment to the said Section be recommended:

Paragraph (b) of subsection (3) of section 94 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(b) if he is advised and believes that a total of fifteen votes will be cast in case an advance poll is established in any city, town, town-ship, village or municipality having a population of five hundred or more as determined by the last census taken pursuant to sections 16 and 17 of the *Statistics Act*, he may add the name of such place.

It was agreed that the said Section otherwise remain unchanged.

On Sections 95, 96 and 97,

It was, after lengthy discussion thereon, agreed that the said Sections remain unchanged.

The Committee considered Form 65 contained in Schedule One and it was agreed that the said Form remain unchanged.

On Form 66 in Schedule One of the said Act

On motion of Mr. Lefrancois,

*Resolved*,—That the following amendment to the said Form be recommended:

Form No. 66 of Schedule One to the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

“Form No. 66

ADVANCE POLL CERTIFICATE AND STATEMENT OF IDENTIFICATION  
(Sec. 96)

#### CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that (*insert full name of applicant elector*), whose occupation as given on the official list of electors is (*insert occupation*), whose address as given thereon is (*insert address*) and whose signature appears hereunder above mine has personally appeared before me and has satisfied me:

(1) That he is now employed.....  
(*insert: “by the.....Railway Company in the capacity of.....” or “on the vessel known as the.....in the capacity of.....” or “by ..... as a commercial traveller”, or “as a fisherman”, (or as the case may be), and*

(2) That by reason of the nature of his said employment and in the course thereof he is necessarily absent from time to time from the place of his ordinary residence, and

(3) That he has reason to believe that he will be so absent on the ordinary polling day at the pending election from, and that he is likely to be unable to vote on such polling day in, the undermentioned polling division on the list of electors for which his name appears, or that he is a member of the reserve forces of the Canadian Forces or that he is a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Force and that, on account of the performance

of duties or training in such forces, he has reason to believe that he will be necessarily absent on such polling day from, and that he is likely to be unable to vote on that day in, the undermentioned polling division on the list of electors for which his name appears, and

(4) That he is the person intended to be described by the entry of the name, occupation and address above set out on the official list of electors entitled to vote at the pending election in polling division No. ...., in the electoral district of.....

And I accordingly certify that he is a person entitled to vote at any advance poll established in the said electoral district on the conditions prescribed in the *Canada Elections Act* and in the instructions for deputy returning officers issued by the chief electoral officer.

Dated at....., this.....day of  
....., 19.....

(Signature of applicant elector).

.....  
Returning Officer (or as the case may be).

#### STATEMENT OF IDENTIFICATION AND DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I am the person described in the above certificate, that all the facts therein stated with respect to my employment and anticipated absence from the place of my ordinary residence on the ordinary polling day are correct, and that I verily believe myself to be the person intended to be referred to by the entry on the official list of electors, the particulars of which are transcribed in the above certificate.

I am aware that, having presented this certificate at an advance poll, I am not entitled to vote at an ordinary polling station on the ordinary polling day.

.....  
(Signature of Applicant elector).

#### PARTICULARS TO BE RECORDED BY POLL CLERK IN THE ADVANCE POLLING STATION

Consecutive number given to the elector as he applies for a ballot paper	FORM NUMBER OF ORAL OATH OR AFFIDAVIT, IF ANY, THE ELECTOR IS REQUIRED TO SWEAR	RECORD THAT OATH SWORN OR REFUSED  (If sworn, insert "Sworn" or "Affirmed"; if refused, insert "Refused to be Sworn" or "Refused to Affirm" or "Refused to Answer")	RECORD THAT ELECTOR HAS VOTED  When ballot paper put into ballot box, insert "Voted"	REMARKS



The Committee reviewed Schedule Two of the Act and it was agreed that the said Schedule remain unchanged.

The Committee reverted to Section 2 of the Act and it was agreed that, except for the amendments thereto, adopted on the 15th March, the said Section remain unchanged.

The Committee having completed its study of the Canada Elections Act, the question of a report thereon to the House was considered, whereupon,

On motion of Mr. Hollingworth,

*Ordered*,—That a report be presented to the House in the form of a draft bill in which shall be embodied in true substance the various amendments to the Canada Elections Act suggested to and adopted by this Committee in its study of the said Act, with a recommendation that the Government at the earliest possible date consider the opportunity of introducing the necessary legislation to give effect to the said proposed amendments to the said Act.

At 12.00 o'clock noon, on motion of Mr. Lefrançois, the Committee adjourned at the call of the Chair.

ANTOINE CHASSÉ,

*Clerk of the Committee.*





## EVIDENCE

April 5, 1955  
10.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum, and we will proceed. You all have copies of the new draft amendments to the Canadian Forces voting regulations now proposed by National Defence. At our previous meeting Mr. Pallett and Mr. Nowlan brought up two points in that regard. Do you wish to say something in that regard, Captain Dewis?

Captain J. P. DEWIS, R.C.N., (*Deputy Judge Advocate General*): Possibly, if there are any questions, I could answer them.

The CHAIRMAN: The explanations are outlined in copies which the members have received this morning. Two members are coming in, and we shall give them a chance to look that over. For the benefit of the gentlemen who were late, we are now going to deal with the draft amendments to the Canadian Forces voting regulations (Schedule Three to the Canada Elections Act). You have a mimeographed copy before you now.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): There is one question that I should like to ask. Previously they were sent by mail, which was really a guarantee that they would get there. Under this, "by other means", you would have to make sure, I suppose, that it was an authorized person who was doing the job of delivering.

Captain DEWIS: If I might say a few words on that, we found that in isolated units up north it was not practicable to get these envelopes back to Edmonton in time to be counted by the special returning officer by mail. However we have R.C.A.F. aircraft flying to different places and we collect the envelopes in boxes at the various voting places and we put them in a bag, and the aircraft would deliver them to the post office and mail them to Edmonton, in which case they would get there in time. That was also done in Korea and Japan, and also as far as Europe was concerned. I believe that Mr. Castonguay mentioned one or two meetings ago that we had some difficulty in getting the ballots from Paris to the U.K. I think that there was a strike on at the time. If we could have loaded them into an R.C.A.F. aircraft, they could have been mailed in London. That is the reason for the provision which Mr. Castonguay has in his paragraph 35, clause 40 "By ordinary mail or by such other facilities as may be available and expeditious . . . ." We could not put them in an R.C.A.F. aircraft because that is not an official posting facility.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): May I ask another question? You would have R.C.A.F. planes wherever the voting would be anyhow, would you not, or would it perhaps have to be some other method?

Captain DEWIS: It would depend on the distance involved, and whether the R.C.A.F. had an aircraft available and how many voters were involved. They might make a special trip for the purpose of picking up the ballots; we would not do it on all occasions, but it could be done, and in fact it has been done on occasions. The present paragraph 35 of the regulations has this provision: "By such other facilities". When that was put in, the amendment proposed in clause one should have been made at the same time, because 35 (1) provided for ballots going also by other than postal facilities. That was amended two or three years ago, and this "by mail" should have been struck out in the definition; it was an oversight.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that clear? Shall the amendment to clause one carry?

Moved by Mr. Dechêne.

Carried.

Clause two.

Captain DEWIS: Might I say a word on that? Clause two arises out of clause three. Mr. Nowlan suggested that the voting list of Canadian Forces electors should include every member who is a member of the regular forces, irrespective of whether he completes a statement of ordinary residence. The effect of clause number three on this mimeographed sheet is to make sure that this list of electors prepared by commanding officers will contain the names of not only those who complete the statement but those of all Canadian forces electors of the unit, whether they have completed the statement or not.

With regard to clause number two, on the printed mimeographed sheet, there is a long list of things which the returning officer is supposed to do. One is to secure from the various liaison officers a list, provided for in paragraph 26 and refers to the names of Canadian Forces electors, as defined in paragraph 20A, and the names of wives and places of ordinary residence of service of their husbands.

If you are going to amend number three, you have to make a similar amendment to 12 (e) and to make it clear that you wish to include those who have not completed statements of ordinary residence. It is more simple to strike out the reference to the contents of the list in 12 (e), but leave the reference securing the lists provided for in paragraph 26, where we have as a result of the proposed amendment lists which will contain all Canadian forces electors.

The CHAIRMAN: We can deal with both of those together.

Moved by Mr. Dechêne that the amendments in clauses two and three carry.

Carried.

Will members please turn to page 2 of the printed draft bill? This amendment to clause three is consequential. Will somebody make a motion that the amendments carry?

Mr. Hollingworth moves that clause three, on page 2 of the printed draft bill carry.

Carried.

At this point I should like to ask the Chief Electoral Officer to express his views on the question of Doukhobors.

**Mr. Nelson J. Castonguay, Chief Electoral Officer, recalled:**

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, may I refer members of the committee to section 14 of the Act, subsection (2) (h), on page 13. This provision is now spent, because it has no effect in any province in Canada. The only province where this had any effect was in the province of British Columbia. In 1953 the provincial legislature removed the disqualification for voting against Doukhobors. The previous committee in 1951 studied this question, and recommended that no action be taken by the federal parliament until such time as the commission making a study of the Doukhobor problem in British Columbia had made its report. I presume that it was in view of this report that the provincial legislature removed the disqualification against Doukhobors and consequently clause (h) is now spent and has no effect. It may be that members of this committee may wish to have this clause (h) repealed in view of this action.



The CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment to Section 14 (2) (h) carry? It is moved by Mr. Vincent.

Mr. DICKEY: I should think, Mr. Chairman, that we might have it moved that paragraph (h) be repealed and that paragraph (i) be relettered (h).

The CHAIRMAN: Correct.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): While we are on that page, Mr. Chairman, 14 (3) would be eliminated also, would it not?

The WITNESS: That would not be eliminated, because there still may be members of the Canadian forces under twenty-one who served in Korea and who have been discharged from the services. This would permit them to vote. If this was not provided, members of the Forces still under twenty-one who served in Korea and who have been discharged from the services could not vote. This now permits them to vote.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): In this case, then, it would allow a service man of sixteen to vote?

The WITNESS: If he had been in the Forces while they were on active service.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): While on active service.

Mr. VINCENT: Even after he is discharged from the service he can vote, if he is under twenty-one?

The WITNESS: If he has been a member of the regular forces on active service and he is still under twenty-one, after discharge he can vote.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): In the 1953 election there were some who voted at the age of sixteen.

The WITNESS: I think you are referring to apprentices. They were taken into the regular forces and were members of the regular forces, and they were seventeen years of age. They were entitled to vote because they were on active service and because of the provisions of subparagraph (2) of paragraph 20 of the Regulations.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): Yes, but they had not seen action.

The WITNESS: But all forces were on active service then.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall Section 14 as amended carry?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 16, on page 15. Also page three of the printed draft bill, clause 5. There is nothing controversial to this clause. It is consequential.

Mr. WHITE (*Waterloo South*): I shall so move.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the clause carry?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Turn to page 231 of the Act, Schedule Four. It gives the list of electoral districts in which nomination day is the twenty-eighth day before polling day.

Mr. Dechêne moves that schedule Four carry.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Turn to page 232, schedule Five. Mr. Robichaud moves that Schedule Five remain unchanged.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Turn to page 9 of the printed draft bill, clause 15 (3).

The WITNESS: Chapter 331 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, has come into force on April first, which means that this is now spent. I suggest that it be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: Moved by Mr. Hollingworth that subclause (3) of clause 15 be withdrawn.

Agreed.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, as you know, Mr. Zaplitny gave notice of motion of a resolution. You all have copies of Mr. Zaplitny's proposed resolution. Do you wish to speak to that, Mr. Zaplitny?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Yes, I shall move it now. As everybody has a copy, I do not need to read the resolution, but in speaking to it, Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw attention to the fact that the principles contained in this, has been endorsed by the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, and more recently by the individual chambers of commerce. I am not in a position to say that every local chamber of commerce has endorsed it, but in the annual convention in Manitoba in 1953, a resolution was passed, and I think I should read that resolution. It is almost the same as mine. There is only one slight change. The resolution passed by the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce in 1953 reads as follows:

The Chamber believes that any qualified voter who signed a sworn statement to the effect that he or she would be unable to vote on polling day at the ordinary polling station due to absence for cause should be able to vote at an advanced poll, and that advance polling stations should be opened sufficiently far in advance of election day to accommodate those who would make use of them.

The Chamber, therefore, urges the Federal Government to provide for the greatly extended use of advance polls in federal elections.

You will note that my motion is a little simpler than that. I have left out the provision referring to a sworn statement, because I would leave it to the Chief Electoral Officer as to the best form of declaration to be used. It might not necessarily be a sworn statement. The other provisions, dealing with the establishment of sufficient polling stations, is dealt with in another part of the Act and is subject to certain dates and provisions, depending on when the writ is issued. Therefore I have made the motion simply read that we deal in principle with the extending of the voting privilege in advance to all persons who make the necessary declaration to the effect that they will be unable to vote on the regular election day, due to absence from polls. The purpose behind this is, of course, the same purpose as, I believe, has been the objective of the committee throughout its sittings this year, that is to provide everything possible to give voting facilities to every Canadian for whom it is physically possible to do so. That is what I am seeking to gain by this motion. I may also point this out. There may be a difference of opinion on this, but I believe that the adoption of this principle would simplify the question of advance polling. As the Act now reads, there are five main categories in which we could divide the persons who are entitled to vote at advance polls. First, there are commercial travellers.

Mr. HOLLINGWORTH: Excuse me; what section is this?

Mr. ZAPLITNY: Section 95, on page 111 of the Act. First there are the commercial travellers. Then there are the fishermen, as defined in subsection (12). Thirdly there are the persons employed upon railways, vessels, airships, or other means or modes of transportation. The fourth group would be the members of the reserve forces of the Canadian forces, and the fifth the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The difficulty which arises is that quite often there is a difference of opinion as to the interpretation of those categories. I think that probably what causes the most headaches is the term "commercial traveller." One can easily define a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted



Police, for example, or an employee of a railway, but the term "commercial travellers" takes in more territory and gives rise to various interpretations, and quite often there are disputes about it. If the privilege of voting at an advance poll were based on the idea that the person is asking for it because he will not be able to vote on the regular election day, then we have only one principle to deal with. There are no definitions required; every qualified voter who is otherwise qualified is then eligible to vote in an advance poll for cause. Now the declaration would be the crux of the whole thing. I realize that there are some people who might say, "What would happen if we had a whole flood of electors wanting to vote at advance polls? We would have two election days instead of one." As a matter of fact, I see no reason why any ordinary elector who has good reason to believe that he will be at home and able to vote would go to the bother of making a certificate simply for the purpose of voting a few days earlier. It would be of no advantage whatever to him and would be merely a nuisance to him, and for that reason alone I can see no great rush of people to the advance polls. But it would overcome the difficulty of so many persons who lose their right of franchise simply because of reasons beyond their control and who are unable to be at their polling divisions on the date of the poll. I also want to submit that this does not solve the problem of absentee polling. This has nothing to do with persons who are not in the particular constituency where they are ordinarily resident on the day when the writ issues. This has to do only with persons who would otherwise be qualified to vote, whose names are on the list, but who for one reason or another are not going to be able to vote on election day.

I can see no objection to it personally; it has many advantages. The only disadvantage I can think of is that it would appear that some might think it would add extra work to the officials who are in charge of the polls, in their having to handle the declarations or issue the certificate. But even if it does add a little more extra work, I think that the disadvantage is more than compensated for, and I would propose that the committee accept this suggestion.

*By Mr. Pouliot:*

Q. Will the Chief Electoral Officer please tell us what total amount of salary is paid to the returning officers, and their staff on enumeration day roughly?—A. It is very difficult to estimate the cost of one day. The average returning officer would normally get, over a period of ten weeks, between \$90 and \$100 a week. Clerical assistance would depend on the size of the constituency. On the average he would have clerical assistance allowances amounting to \$500 or \$600.

Q. And what about the deputy returning officer?—A. He is now paid on the basis of \$12; the poll clerk is paid \$8; and the rental is \$10.

Q. And the clerk?—A. He gets \$8.

Q. So, what is the average cost on election day?—A. You mean the average cost per poll?

Q. For returning officer, the deputy returning officer, the clerk and the rent.—A. About thirty two or thirty-three dollars.

Q. How many do you have?—A. We have about 45,000.

Q. You say you have about 45,000 polls?—A. At the last election we had a total of 40,836 polling stations.

Q. Will you please multiply that by \$33, just to know what it is.—A. I think it would be around \$1½ million.

Q. You say around \$1½ million?—A. So election day actually costs around \$1½ million and if we had three election days, it would be \$3 and three quarter million.

Q. What do you think of having three election days instead of one?—A. The members of the committee may be interested in the number of advance

polls at the last election. There were 102 electoral districts which did not have an advance poll. 131 had one advance poll; and the other 30 had more than one. If the privilege of voting at an advance poll was extended to all electors, it goes without saying that we would have to provide more facilities. We would not have to provide them to the same extent as you would do for ordinary polling day. However, no one could say actually just how many we would have to have, but I presume we would have to have at least one to about every fifteen polling divisions. That is, we would have to have fifteen advance polling stations where we now would have one, for example, in an urban constituency.

On the basis that we would have one advance poll per 15 polling divisions of electors in an electoral district, that is a ratio of 1 to 15, we would have to provide this number in each electoral district. But that is purely an arbitrary figure. I do not think anyone could tell exactly how many electors there would be who would want to make use of an advance poll if that privilege were to be extended to everybody; that is, how many would want to vote at an advance poll on Thursday, Friday or Saturday. We would have to start off with the yardstick of one advance poll per 15 polling divisions.

An advance poll costs in the neighbourhood of one hundred dollars, and on the basis of ten advance polls per electoral district—the minimum would be ten—that would mean an expenditure of some \$250,000 of additional expenses; that would be for the additional advance polls required to take care of additional traffic which may result if the privilege were extended to all electors. Yet I would not be too sure that even one advance poll per fifteen polling divisions would be sufficient to handle such traffic.

There are no statistics we can go by to estimate such traffic, but we would have to start off with a bare minimum which I figure would be one advance poll to fifteen polling divisions. That is simply for the wholly urban constituencies, because there I think that one could work on a ratio of 1 to 15. But when you tackle the wholly rural constituencies, we would have to provide the same conveniences for them. We would have to reduce the ratio to one advance poll per four or five polling divisions, because if we did not, the electors in rural areas might have to go twenty to thirty miles in order to vote at an advance poll, whereas in the city they do not have to go more than one quarter of a mile.

I presume the members of the committee would be interested in providing the same facilities for the rural as well as the urban voters. I submit that it is not only a question of extending the privilege which is involved, but also a question of providing adequate and additional facilities to permit the electors to avail themselves of this privilege.

With respect to the vote at the advance poll under our present provisions, at the last general election 10,559 electors voted at 243 advance polls. This number of voters has remained pretty well the same since advance polls were established. Since 1921, it has never been higher than 11,200, or lower than 6,947.

The CHAIRMAN: Does anybody else wish to speak to this motion?

Mr. HANSELL: Mr. Chairman, I am all in favour of getting everyone out who has a vote, and I think that is true of all of us. I would like to support this if it were not for some doubt in my mind.

My doubt is whether a thing of this kind would not be taken undue advantage of. Is there any way you could protect a person's vote? For instance, we do know that a good many votes are stolen. In other words, a person goes in to vote at noon or in the afternoon, only to find that somebody has voted in his place, has stolen his name, has impersonated him. That is done and there is nothing that you can do about it.



A person comes in to vote and finds that his name is gone. No one knows where he came from. Now, how could voters be protected under this. I visualize for instance a city where there is a bit of skulduggery done, and we would say that at a couple of hundred polls three, or four, or half a dozen in each poll have voted previously on a declaration such as might be described in this resolution, and then we find that those declarations were spurious. A person comes along on election day only to find that he cannot vote because some one else has already voted and made this declaration. He says: "I did not make it."

What can be done about that? That is the difficulty which I see here. I would like to support it, but I do not want anything like that to happen.

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, as members of the committee know, the advance poll takes place on the Thursday, Friday, and Saturday immediately preceding the ordinary polling day. At present, in view of the limited nature of the provisions of Section 95 of the Act, it is possible for the returning officer to send a duplicate of the certificate which he issues to the person who has applied for it, to the poll where that person would normally vote, and therefore prevent double voting.

Because of the limited nature of the section there would not be more than 30 or 40 voters, generally speaking, who, in practice, would vote at an advance poll. Therefore, it is only a question on the Saturday night before Monday the ordinary polling day of having 30 or 40 certificates delivered to the various deputy returning officers concerned.

I submit that if this privilege was extended to everyone, let us say that 5 per cent of the electorate used these facilities, out of 40,000 electors it would mean that 2,000 certificates would have to be delivered from Saturday night to the following Monday to prevent doubling voting.

I know of no way to prevent what Mr. Hansell has mentioned. I think that the only way you can prevent double voting is to notify the deputy returning officer in the ordinary poll that someone has voted at an advance poll. And by advancing the poll to the week previous, the eleventh, tenth, and ninth day before the ordinary polling day, we would have an interval of eight days between the last day of voting at the advance poll and ordinary polling day in order to enable the returning officer to strike off the names on his list of the electors who have voted at the advance poll.

Mr. POULIOT: Hear, hear!

The WITNESS: That is the only way it could be done. In the cities I would say that the ballot boxes would not normally have been delivered to the deputy returning officers before the eighth day before polling day, therefore the returning officer could possibly strike off the list any names of electors who voted at an advance poll. However, he might also strike off the name of an elector who had been impersonated. I do not know of any way to prevent it except by persons at the poll who represent the candidates, challenging these electors, because they would probably know the electors. I know of no way if the privilege is extended to prevent an elector from attempting to vote twice except by putting a larger period between the advance poll and the ordinary polling day to permit the returning officer to take the necessary steps to notify the deputy returning officers concerned. If such a period were provided there would be two to three thousand ballot boxes in the custody of the deputy returning officers for a period of a week or eight days, and this was not desirable. The problem is more difficult in some rural areas because the ballot boxes ordinarily are sent a week before polling day by registered mail, and the deputy returning officers in some cases would receive them three weeks before polling day. Therefore some means would have to be devised

in rural polling places to notify the deputy returning officer that an elector has voted at an advance poll, and that should he present himself to vote at the ordinary poll, he should be challenged or not be permitted to vote.

Mr. DICKEY: I think we all agree that we should extend the privilege of voting to as many Canadians as practical and possible. At the same time I think that a good many members of the committee will agree with Mr. Hansell's view that that has to be weighed against the possibility of abuses and unfairness. It seems to me that one of the main protections against impersonation, people voting improperly under the name of somebody else, is the fact that our system is based on the local polling division. The various candidates select from within that polling division, normally, agents to be in the poll those who have a reasonable opportunity of knowing a number, at least, of the individuals who will be voting. Thus they are in a position to have some reasonable chance of recognizing an impersonator and of preventing that person from voting improperly.

But if you are going to have an advanced poll on a wider basis than, let us say, one to 15 polling divisions, it is going to be an impossible job for the agents to have any real chance of controlling impersonation. I think that it might open the door to a very much wider avoidance of the Election Act and to some real injustice. I would be very much afraid of it from that point of view.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: If what Mr. Dickey says is so, on the question of impersonation, then is it not a fact that with the few people voting at the advance poll that there is now—where in some constituencies there is only one advance poll in the whole constituency—then, according to Mr. Dickey's argument the chances of impersonation would be much greater because you will have voters coming in from greater distance. You cannot have it both ways.

Mr. DICKEY: Take the advance poll now. It averages 50 or 60 votes. If you enlarge the method you will get one thousand people voting in the advance poll.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. ELLIS: Mr. Chairman, there is a danger of these people creeping in. Under the existing set-up, and under the normal vote, our scrutineers are constantly on watch for any contravention of the Election Act. I think there is a great deal of merit in the Chief Electoral Officer's suggestion of moving the date ahead by a week or so. If the advance poll is held a week ahead of election day it would be much more effective than if held just a few days before that day.

The Chief Electoral Officer has said that in the last federal election he found that some people had left their homes before the election. In other words, if the advance poll was held a week before voting day, it would enable more people to vote who would ordinarily be absent from their homes on election day.

I think the objection raised here could be met. I think the greatest danger of impersonation occurs in the larger cities. In rural areas the average voter is known. Everybody knows everyone else. So it is in the larger city polls where you have a situation where your scrutineers might not know more than a mere fraction of the voters.

The Chief Electoral Officer pointed out that if the advance poll was set eight days ahead, certainly in the larger cities at least that is as far as we can go. Right now we have an advance poll and we have a certain group permitted to use it, such as commercial travellers, railroad employees, and so on. But there are a great many others who are called upon to leave their



homes on voting day, such as construction workers, who are doing work outside their cities' on election day. I know of quite a number who were called on to vote outside their own districts.

Mr. HOLLINGWORTH: Protection is given them under "commercial travellers".

Mr. ELLIS: I do not think that people whose normal occupation is not that of a commercial traveller or railroad employee would be allowed to vote.

The CHAIRMAN: Pardon me. Look at page 1 of the Act. The thing is defined there in clause 2 under "interpretation", subsection 4, commercial travellers and so on. That is where you will find the interpretation of the Act.

Mr. ELLIS: It says right here:

(4) 'Commercial traveller' means a person employed on salary or on commission by a manufacturer or wholesale merchant to travel from place to place selling goods to, or taking orders for goods from, jobbers and retailers;

Certainly I would suggest there are a great many other groups who are obliged to leave their homes on election day in the course of their jobs, who do not qualify to vote at the advance poll. Why draw the line there? These days that have been suggested exist in the limited voting facilities we have now. Why not go as far as it is possible to go? I realize that in rural constituencies there may be many great difficulties in delivering the ballot boxes and getting the services, but let us go as far as we can go. Within the limits of practicability, why not extend this principle as much as possible?

Mr. HOLLINGWORTH: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this problem has probably come up because we had the last election in August. In my riding many of the employees from the A. V. Roe Company were on vacation for two weeks. I think it can be stated that it was an extraordinary circumstance that we had an election in August, because of the Coronation. The chances are that we will never have an August general election, because fewer people can vote. I think that in August not only construction workers are away, but also people on vacation. I do not think that this is going to happen when you have an election in June, and that is generally when we have an election. I should like to ask Mr. Castonguay if he has had any complaints from people in certain occupations about not being able to vote?

The WITNESS: All the representations I received are in the minutes of the first meeting. They are all listed there.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): Summer schools.

Mr. HOLLINGWORTH: I think much has to be said for Mr. Hansell's argument and Mr. Dickey's argument that, particularly with an increased population from people coming in from Europe, there is a chance that this privilege will be abused if it is extended too far. I am more concerned about that than the additional cost.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): I know of half a dozen men who are inspectors or service men in industry who do not come under "commercial travellers". They would lose their vote entirely. While they are not commercial travellers, they have to go out of their riding and are away on election day. I have also had commercial travellers say to me, "We are not at home on the Thursday, Friday or Saturday before the elections; we might be home the week before; sometimes we are home on those Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays before the election, but perhaps at the following election we are not there, and it is the week before, when we are at home on our weekly

trip." I know that many commercial travellers do not vote, and I think that is the reason why our advance poll does not pick up the votes it should pick up.

The CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. HANSELL: Before the question is put, may I say this? The other day I asked how the advance poll was established, and the Chief Electoral Officer indicated, I think, that any town or village that is incorporated with a population of over five hundred could apply. I should like to ask this: is the application made through the municipal authorities? Could I make it, for instance?

The WITNESS: Yes, the procedure is set out in section 94, subsection (3), of the Act:

The Chief Electoral Officer may from time to time amend Schedule Two by striking therefrom the name of any place or by adding thereto the name of any other place, and, so amended, such schedule has effect as if incorporated into this Act; but he shall amend under the following circumstances only:

- (b) If he is advised and believes that a total of fifteen votes will be cast in case an advance poll is established in any incorporated village, town or city having a population of five hundred or more as determined by the last census taken pursuant to sections 16 and 17 of the Statistics Act, he may add the name of such place.

Having approved the establishment of advance poll, the notice of the establishment must be published in the *Canada Gazette* for a period of sixty days. However, if a writ is issued in that period the advance poll cannot be established for that election. Representations are received from the members, from the returning officers, etc., and all they have to do is satisfy me that fifteen votes will be cast, and then I will authorize its establishment.

Mr. BOURQUE: You told us that it costs \$250,000 for 11,200 maximum votes. Is that right?

The WITNESS: No. That would be if the privilege were extended to all electors; I feel it may be necessary for me to establish about ten advance polls per constituency. That would represent about 2,600 advance polls. An advance poll costs about \$100, and therefore the minimum cost of extending the privilege to everyone would be in the neighbourhood of \$250,000. Now we have 243 advance polls at \$100, and the votes were 10,559 at the last election. So it would roughly cost \$24,000 for 10,559 votes.

Mr. ZAPLITNY: I should like to refer the committee to item number 23 in the first minutes of proceedings of the committee, in which there is a letter from the Canadian Chamber of Commerce to the previous Secretary of State. As hon. members know, the Chambers of Commerce throughout Canada are in very close touch with a great number of people, and certainly, if the Canadian Chambers of Commerce thought it important enough to pass a resolution at their annual convention and to send their representations to the Secretary of State, that indicates, I think, that it is based on a heavy demand throughout the country. This is not something they have dreamed up; it is based on the wish of thousands of members. I submit that that is reason enough for us to give it consideration. I should like to say a word now in connection with this question of how many people would take advantage of it. I think we would be wrong in basing our estimate on the figures of how many people did not vote at a previous election. We know there are a large number of people in every election who do not vote, and their reason for not voting is not the lack of facilities. A large number of electors simply do not vote, for personal or



other reasons; they do not care to make a choice or for some other reason they do not vote. This is an attempt to provide an opportunity for those who do want an opportunity to vote. My understanding was at the very beginning of the sittings of this committee that that was the chief objective of the committee this year. It was stated by the Secretary of State at the opening meeting that it was our desire to extend every possible means for those who wished to exercise the franchise.

I would suggest this to the committee. If they have some misgivings about going into this on a large scale, why as an experiment can the Act not be amended and then tried out to see if it is practicable? Why not establish a reasonable number of advance polls, not sufficient to be convenient for everyone, but a reasonable number, something between what would be required to provide reasonable facilities, and what we have now, which is far from satisfactory? On the basis of that experience in an election, the committee would have something on which to base its opinion. As the Chief Electoral Officer said, we have no experience on which to base an opinion. We do not know how many people would take advantage of it. We do not know what difficulties would arise. This question of impersonation, of course, arises on any election day, but there are provisions in the Act to take care of it. It is illegal to impersonate. No one can stop people from breaking the law but we can punish them if they do so. I would say that it would be an experiment well worth trying in an election. If it is found to be unsatisfactory, then the hands of this or any other committee or parliament are not bound. The Act can be changed again. Certainly, with the demand across the country for extension of this privilege, we would be well advised to try that as an experiment, to give everybody an opportunity which it is physically possible to give. Based on that experience at a future time we would be able to revise the Act further as it should be.

The CHAIRMAN: Those in favour of Mr. Zaplitny's resolution will please raise their right hands? 7; Against? 15.

I declare the resolution lost.

Section 94, on page 110. It is also on page 9 of the printed draft amendment, clause 14. Moved by Mr. White (*Waterloo South*).

The WITNESS: As I explained at a previous meeting, this amendment will enable me to establish an advance poll in an electoral district such as Esquimalt-Saanich where there is no incorporated town, city or village within its boundaries. Representations were received to establish an advance poll there, and I was unable to establish one.

The CHAIRMAN: Does Section 94 as amended carry?

Carried.

Mr. NOWLAN: I have a question concerning section 95. I think there is much merit in what has been said this morning about the limitations for railwaymen and commercial travellers. It seems rather unfair that a man in one type of work gets a vote and his next-door neighbour does not. The world has moved a great deal since this definition was drafted. For instance, you have insurance salesmen, you have insurance inspectors and I can think of a whole group of people who might lose a vote because of the nature of their employment. I wonder if it would be possible for the Chief Electoral Officer or the committee, if it saw fit, to eliminate these terms, "Commercial travellers", "railroad men" and "fishermen", and include anyone who because of the ordinary nature of his employment is absent, if he makes a declaration to that effect. That would take in quite a number of people who today are deprived of a vote. It would not be subject to abuse, and yet the person's name and his occupation would appear in the list, and it would be only those people who would have that privilege. There are many such groups of people.

There are people who are engaged in different types of services who do not come within the definition of commercial traveller, and I think that in this modern world we could consider that instead of restricting them because of their type of business, we could include all these people by saying: "because of the ordinary nature of their employment would be absent on election day".

The CHAIRMAN: I think that that takes us right back to Mr. Zaplitny's motion.

Mr. NOWLAN: No, Mr. Zaplitny's motion includes people who cannot vote because they are on vacation and people who find that they have to go away for employment or for some other reason.

Mr. FRASER (*Peterborough*): There is a definition of who can vote.

Mr. NOWLAN: It would involve dropping the term "commercial traveller" and so on and putting, "because of the nature of their regular employment".

The WITNESS: The more you broaden the classes of persons who would have the privilege of voting at advance polls, the more facilities you would necessarily have to provide. But generally speaking, we establish advance polls now in railway centres where there is a fairly reasonable well-known number of railway employees who would avail themselves of that privilege. However, if you broaden this to the extent that for reasons of any employment a person could be entitled to vote at an advance poll, I would submit that that would have to be accompanied by the furnishing of equal facilities. There are one hundred and two constituencies with no advance polls, and there are one hundred and thirty-one with only one. I submit that in a rural area, for every polling division we would not have to establish an advance poll. We may be able to group four or five polling divisions into one advance polling district, but I submit that the more you extend this privilege the more facilities you would have to provide. I would hate to face this committee after the next general election, after not having provided the proper facilities for voting at advance polls, and I would feel in duty bound to provide the facilities to all electors who are entitled to the privileges.

Mr. NOWLAN: It would not mean doubling the poll.

The WITNESS: No. If it were made "for reasons of employment", in a wholly urban constituency, I would still use the yardstick of fifteen urban polling divisions per advance poll because fifteen urban polling divisions represents roughly three thousand electors and three hundred electors per poll is all it could handle per day. The Act recognizes this. Three hundred electors is the most a poll can satisfactorily handle. I would have to provide facilities per group of fifteen polling divisions of one advance poll so that on the first day or any day thereafter the maximum number of electors could be handled on each day. If there are three thousand electors in an advance polling district, one advance poll could handle the maximum of, say, ten per cent, namely three hundred electors. If that went to 20 per cent, we have to divide that advance poll district in two and establish another advance poll, but I would have to do it when the voting takes place and that would not be too satisfactory. There is no means for me to find exactly how many people at any given time would want to use those facilities. However, I would be duty bound to provide adequate facilities, and I would not like to face this committee if an insufficient number of advance polls had not been provided to handle the voting at a general election. I do not think that that makes for efficiency in the conduct of elections.

*By Mr. Ellis:*

Q. Is it not true that the vote at the advanced poll is quite low?—A. Very low, with 243 advance polls.



Q. If the Act were changed to include in addition to commercial travellers and railroad employees, persons who in the normal course of their work are called to go on the road—I do not know how it should be worded—I think it might double the number of voters who would be qualified to vote. Under those circumstances, if you could double or triple the number, you would still have a comparatively low vote.

Another point I feel about this matter is that you will find generally that the people who would be included under a broadening of this provision are located, generally speaking, in the localities where the advanced polls presently exist. In a provincial capital for instance you will find a great many civil servants and inspectors who are out on the road from Monday morning until Saturday. In order to vote they may find it necessary to stay off the job a whole day.

There are bank inspectors and other business people who are not selling goods and therefore do not come under the Act, and you are going to find that where these people are presently residing there are already advanced polls. So the question is: shall we extend the privilege of voting to people in those areas? That to my mind is the issue here. I ask the Chief Electoral Officer to comment.

A. I do not think that I explained myself quite clearly.

Advance polls are now established for certain classes of people. It has been proven over the years that the facilities which are now provided are sufficient to handle the votes of commercial travellers, transportation employees, and so on. If you extend the privilege to all persons who for reason of employment cannot be in their home polling division on polling day, we will have to provide more facilities, because it is not possible for anyone to estimate the number of electors who would avail themselves of these facilities. Now it is possible to estimate the number of persons who will use such facilities as it is restricted to commercial travellers, fishermen, the R.C.M.P., transportation employees and members of the reserve forces.

There has never been more than three hundred electors who voted at an advance poll. With 243 advance polls, only ten thousand have voted. But if it is extended for reasons of employment, then only one advance poll in a wholly urban constituency would not be sufficient. In a wholly rural constituency, you might find from 100 to 200 such electors in small towns and villages situated in the constituency. There may be only one advance poll in that rural electoral district and it would not be conveniently situated to take the votes of all electors as now it is established at a railway junction for railway employees. If you extend this for reasons of employment, then the electors in the other villages or towns in the constituency would want the same facilities. Therefore I would have to establish advance polls at such villages and towns. It may be possible to establish one advance poll per each group of four or five polling divisions. However, where now one advance poll is sufficient in a rural district, it would require at least 20 advance polls to provide adequate facilities. If one village has one, and another village which is 40 miles away has not one, it will want to have one, too, as the electors there will not want to drive 40 miles in order to vote at an advance poll. Therefore, if you have one established at a railroad junction in a wholly rural constituency, I submit it would not be sufficient to provide the facilities for all the electors who might, for reasons of employment, want to vote at an advance poll in that constituency.

We have given you the figures for a wholly urban constituency. It has never been more than an average of 50 votes per advance poll. Therefore, we feel that one in an urban constituency is reasonably sufficient to take the votes of electors now entitled to vote at an advance poll.

10,559 votes were cast at advance polls at the 1953 election. It used to be that only the electors, for example, in Maniwaki who were on the list of electors at Maniwaki were entitled to vote at the advance poll there. No one else who had the privilege in the constituency of Gatineau could come and vote at the advance poll there because he was not on the list of any polling division in Maniwaki. That rule was changed for the 1953 election and any elector of Gatineau who was given the privilege of voting by section 95 of the Act could vote at the advance poll at Maniwaki. But it takes care of commercial travellers and railroad transportation employees who go to Maniwaki. A limit was put on me, so that I could not establish an advance poll unless it was in an incorporated city, town or village of 500 population.

Mr. ELLIS: Would you say that it is because of increased expenditure that this privilege should not be extended for strictly rural constituencies, that is, beyond the limit of those persons who must be away from their homes on election day? We already have certain facilities for advance polls set up. But under the present circumstances I am certain that in a great many rural constituencies the people who would normally be able to vote at an advance poll cannot do so because there is no advance poll which is handy to them.

Therefore since that situation already exists I submit there will be no unfairness in extending the privilege in existing advance polls to those who in the normal course of their jobs are required to be away from their homes on election day. And I would go that far because with the situation as it stands now there are people who are denied. There are small towns where there is only one train-crew in that particular locality; perhaps some small center where there are only two or three commercial travellers, and where there may not be an advance poll. Therefore, the system is not perfect right now, so why not make the privilege of having an advance poll available to a greater number of people by extending it to include those who are not commercial travellers, fishermen, R.C.M.P. or railroad employees.

Mr. DECHÊNE: Mr. Chairman, have we a motion?

The CHAIRMAN: No, there is no motion.

Mr. RICHARD (*Ottawa East*): We have dispensed with the motion. I understand we are talking now about people who normally would be away. That is much like the motion which we had before. But I think we have talked this over before. It is a definition of the type of people who should be entitled to vote because their occupation entitles them to do so, that is, because of their occupation they must be away from home. I think we are getting out of order.

*By Mr. Hansell:*

Q. I would like to approach this matter from another angle. I am concerned about the people who perhaps should have voted at an advance poll but have not done so, and those who want to vote at a poll where they are not located at the time of election day. If I am not in order, please tell me and I will wait until we get to that point. To me it is a very important matter.

Let me give you an illustration: at one place in my own constituency there was a project going on. The contractor for the project called in a number of workers, perhaps about a hundred of them. Those workers had come from various parts outside my constituency altogether. It was a type of work where the contractor brings in his own employees.

On election day they had quite an argument at the poll because about 30 of these men arrived and wanted to vote. Their actual place of residence was not in that locality at all. Their names were not on the list, I think. They claimed they had been there the required length of time. They were



missed from the list because they were not known. The argument was whether or not they were entitled to vote there when their homes actually were in some other part of the country.—A. They would be entitled to vote under the provisions of section 16, subsection 10, if they met the conditions which are set out in that subsection; if they were there on the date of the issue of the writ, even though they were temporarily resident there, while temporarily employed in the pursuit of their ordinary gainful occupation, they would be entitled to vote in that constituency. If they met these conditions, they would be entitled to vote.

Mr. DICKEY: This covers men on construction work, not just the ones who are there on a temporary basis. Most real construction workers come under this.

The WITNESS: Yes, they do.

*By Mr. Hansell:*

Q. I believe the same thing could happen at a summer resort where there may be an influx of workers, such as at our national parks, for instance, where there is an influx of workers and students as waitresses and that kind of thing, at the large hotels. They may come from all parts of the country and remain only for the summer months, perhaps three or four months, because they are working there. And on election day, when they come to vote, the argument is: "Do you live here?" "Well, I do not. My home is not here. A. They are taken care of under the provisions of subsection 12 of section 16 I am here now for a little while, although I shall be going back home later."—which reads as follows:

(12) No person shall, for the purpose of this Act, be deemed to be ordinarily resident at the date of the issue of the writ ordering an election in an electoral district to which such person has come for the purpose of engaging temporarily in the execution of any federal or provincial public work, or as a resident in any camp temporarily established in connection with any such public work under federal or provincial government control located in such electoral district, unless such person has been in continuous residence therein for at least thirty days immediately preceding the date of the issue of such writ.

That would apply to persons who are working there in their ordinary gainful occupations, such as bell boys, porters, housemen, and chambermaids. Provided they are there on the date of the issue of the Writ and continue to be there on polling day, they are entitled to vote.

Q. Even though their names are not on the list?—A. They can be "voted" under the procedure set out in section 46 of the Act.

The CHAIRMAN: Clause 95 "Who may vote at advance polls." No change.

Clause 96 "Conditions for voting at advance polls." No change.

Clause 97 "Examining and sealing ballot box." No change.

Form 65, on page 177 of the Act. No change.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Form 66, on page 21 of the printed draft amendment, "Advance poll certificates and statement of identification." Amendment moved by Mr. Lefrancois.

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Schedule 2 on page 180 of the Act?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 2 of the Act on the first page of the Act "Interpretation"?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: Section 2 as amended?

Carried.

Mr. HOLLINGWORTH: I move:

That a report be presented to the House in the form of a draft bill in which shall be embodied in true substance the various amendments to the Canada Elections Act suggested to and adopted by this committee in its study of the said Act, with a recommendation that the Government at the earliest possible date consider the opportunity of introducing the necessary legislation to give effect to the said proposed amendments to the said Act.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion moved by Mr. Hollingworth. All those in favour? Contrary?

Carried.

The CHAIRMAN: That finishes the first phase of our work. I am not going to make any forecast as to the second phase of our terms of reference. Will somebody move that we adjourn at the call of the chair?

Mr. LEFRANCOIS: I move that we adjourn to the call of the chair.

The CHAIRMAN: You have heard the motion? All those in favour? Contrary?

Carried.

Carried.

The committee adjourned.















